



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,654	08/05/2003	Lalitha Vaidyanathan	1018-001US02	6366
28863 7590 10/01/2008 SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P. A. 1625 RADIO DRIVE SUITE 300 WOODBURY, MN 55125				
EXAMINER ARAQUE JR, GERARDO				
ART UNIT 3689		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 10/01/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pairedocketing@ssiplay.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/634,654

Applicant(s)

VAIDYANATHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Gerardo Araque Jr.

Art Unit

3689

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-106 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-106 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1 – 5, drawn to a method and system of determining and presenting a proposed solution to a dispute, classified in class 705, subclass 80.
 - II. Claims 6 – 8, drawn to a method of resolving a transaction dispute and proposing one or more resolution suggestions and identifying a plurality of sub-markets of an online marketplace, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
 - III. Claims 9 – 27, drawn to a method and system of determining one or more proposed solutions to a dispute and identifying a point of entry from which an online dispute resolution process was initiated, classified in class 705, subclass 80.
 - IV. Claims 28 – 38, drawn to a method and system of processing a dispute in accordance with an automatic verification process, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
 - V. Claims 39 – 55, drawn to a method and system of presenting a proposed resolution regarding an online dispute by routing case information through dispute resolution modules and applying online dispute resolution process, classified in class 705, subclass 1.

- VI. Claims 56 – 71, drawn to a method and system of determining a proposed resolution of a dispute by through the use of a reputation rating system of an online marketplace and updating the reputation rating system of at least on a party as a function of the resolution, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
- VII. Claims 72 – 78, drawn to a method of automatically updating a reputation rating of a user of an online marketplace by monitoring the online marketplace to detect feedback by a second user and notifying the first user of negative feedback to resolve a dispute on which the feedback is based, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
- VIII. Claims 79 – 87 and 102, drawn to methods of resolving a dispute by receiving commitment for a payment for the electronic dispute resolution process from the parties, receiving payment from the parties, and presenting the proposed resolution, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
- IX. Claims 88 – 101, drawn to a method of administering an online resolution dispute process by automatically prioritizing for handling by a dispute resolution specialist, presenting an interface to highlight key attributes, displaying visual alerts if cases are not handled according to defined parameters, and displaying the disputes to the specialist based on the prioritization, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
- X. Claims 103 – 106, drawn to a method of accepting a commitment made by an online entity to a selling practice, delivering a media object to a device

for presentment to a potential buyer wherein the media object is unique to the online entity and representative of a seal of certification of the online entity, and applying the online dispute resolution process to any dispute that arises between the online entity and the potential buyer, classified in class 705, subclass 1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group I is directed to a method and system of determining and presenting a proposed solution to a dispute while Group II is directed to a method of resolving a transaction dispute and proposing one or more resolution suggestions and identifying a plurality of sub-markets of an online marketplace. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

3. Inventions I and III are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as

claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group I is directed to a method and system of determining and presenting a proposed solution to a dispute while Group III is directed to a method and system of determining one or more proposed solutions to a dispute and identifying a point of entry from which an online dispute resolution process was initiated. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

4. Inventions I and IV are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group I is directed to a method and system of determining and presenting a proposed solution to a dispute while Group IV is directed to a method and system of processing a dispute in accordance with an automatic verification process. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

5. Inventions I and V are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the

inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group I is directed to a method and system of determining and presenting a proposed solution to a dispute while Group V is directed to a method and system of presenting a proposed resolution regarding an online dispute by routing case information through dispute resolution modules and applying online dispute resolution process. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

6. Inventions I and VI are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group I is directed to a method and system of determining and presenting a proposed solution to a dispute while Group VI is directed to a method and system of determining a proposed resolution of a dispute by through the use of a reputation rating system of an online marketplace and updating the reputation rating system of at least on a party as a function of the resolution. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

7. Inventions I and VII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group I is directed to a method and system of determining and presenting a proposed solution to a dispute while Group VII is directed to a method of automatically updating a reputation rating of a user of an online marketplace by monitoring the online marketplace to detect feedback by a second user and notifying the first user of negative feedback to resolve a dispute on which the feedback is based. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

8. Inventions I and VIII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group I is directed to a method and system of determining and presenting a proposed solution to a dispute while Group VIII is directed to methods of resolving a dispute by receiving commitment for a payment for the electronic dispute resolution process from the parties, receiving

payment from the parties, and presenting the proposed resolution. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

9. Inventions I and IX are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group I is directed to a method and system of determining and presenting a proposed solution to a dispute while Group IX is directed to a method of administering an online resolution dispute process by automatically prioritizing for handling by a dispute resolution specialist, presenting an interface to highlight key attributes, displaying visual alerts if cases are not handled according to defined parameters, and displaying the disputes to the specialist based on the prioritization. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

10. Inventions I and X are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the

inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group I is directed to a method and system of determining and presenting a proposed solution to a dispute while Group X is directed to a method of accepting a commitment made by an online entity to a selling practice, delivering a media object to a device for presentment to a potential buyer wherein the media object is unique to the online entity and representative of a seal of certification of the online entity, and applying the online dispute resolution process to any dispute that arises between the online entity and the potential buyer. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

11. Inventions II and III are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group II is directed to a method of resolving a transaction dispute and proposing one or more resolution suggestions and identifying a plurality of sub-markets of an online marketplace while Group III is directed to a method and system of determining one or more proposed solutions to a dispute and identifying a point of entry from which an online dispute resolution process was initiated. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

12. Inventions II and IV are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group II is directed to a method of resolving a transaction dispute and proposing one or more resolution suggestions and identifying a plurality of sub-markets of an online marketplace while Group IV is directed to a method and system of processing a dispute in accordance with an automatic verification process. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

13. Inventions II and V are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group II is directed to a method of resolving a transaction dispute and proposing one or more resolution suggestions and identifying a plurality of sub-markets of an online marketplace while Group V is directed to a method and system of presenting a proposed resolution regarding an online dispute by routing case information through dispute resolution

modules and applying online dispute resolution process. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

14. Inventions II and VI are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group II is directed to a method of resolving a transaction dispute and proposing one or more resolution suggestions and identifying a plurality of sub-markets of an online marketplace while Group VI is directed to a method and system of determining a proposed resolution of a dispute by through the use of a reputation rating system of an online marketplace and updating the reputation rating system of at least on a party as a function of the resolution. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

15. Inventions II and VII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group II is directed

to a method of resolving a transaction dispute and proposing one or more resolution suggestions and identifying a plurality of sub-markets of an online marketplace while Group VII is directed to a method of automatically updating a reputation rating of a user of an online marketplace by monitoring the online marketplace to detect feedback by a second user and notifying the first user of negative feedback to resolve a dispute on which the feedback is based. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

16. Inventions II and VIII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group II is directed to a method of resolving a transaction dispute and proposing one or more resolution suggestions and identifying a plurality of sub-markets of an online marketplace while Group VIII is directed to methods of resolving a dispute by receiving commitment for a payment for the electronic dispute resolution process from the parties, receiving payment from the parties, and presenting the proposed resolution. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

17. Inventions II and IX are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group II is directed to a method of resolving a transaction dispute and proposing one or more resolution suggestions and identifying a plurality of sub-markets of an online marketplace while Group IX is directed to a method of administering an online resolution dispute process by automatically prioritizing for handling by a dispute resolution specialist, presenting an interface to highlight key attributes, displaying visual alerts if cases are not handled according to defined parameters, and displaying the disputes to the specialist based on the prioritization. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

18. Inventions II and X are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group II is directed to a method of resolving a transaction dispute and proposing one or more resolution

suggestions and identifying a plurality of sub-markets of an online marketplace while Group X is directed to a method of accepting a commitment made by an online entity to a selling practice, delivering a media object to a device for presentment to a potential buyer wherein the media object is unique to the online entity and representative of a seal of certification of the online entity, and applying the online dispute resolution process to any dispute that arises between the online entity and the potential buyer. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

19. Inventions III and IV are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group III is directed to a method and system of determining one or more proposed solutions to a dispute and identifying a point of entry from which an online dispute resolution process was initiated while Group IV is directed to a method and system of processing a dispute in accordance with an automatic verification process. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

20. Inventions III and V are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can

have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group III is directed to a method and system of determining one or more proposed solutions to a dispute and identifying a point of entry from which an online dispute resolution process was initiated while Group V is directed to a method and system of presenting a proposed resolution regarding an online dispute by routing case information through dispute resolution modules and applying online dispute resolution process. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

21. Inventions III and VI are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group III is directed to a method and system of determining one or more proposed solutions to a dispute and identifying a point of entry from which an online dispute resolution process was initiated while Group VI is directed to a method and system of determining a proposed resolution of a dispute by through the use of a reputation rating system of an online marketplace and updating the reputation rating system of at least on a party as a

function of the resolution. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

22. Inventions III and VII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group III is directed to a method and system of determining one or more proposed solutions to a dispute and identifying a point of entry from which an online dispute resolution process was initiated while Group VII is directed to a method of automatically updating a reputation rating of a user of an online marketplace by monitoring the online marketplace to detect feedback by a second user and notifying the first user of negative feedback to resolve a dispute on which the feedback is based. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

23. Inventions III and VIII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the

inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group III is directed to a method and system of determining one or more proposed solutions to a dispute and identifying a point of entry from which an online dispute resolution process was initiated while Group VIII is directed methods of resolving a dispute by receiving commitment for a payment for the electronic dispute resolution process from the parties, receiving payment from the parties, and presenting the proposed resolution.

Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

24. Inventions III and IX are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group III is directed to a method and system of determining one or more proposed solutions to a dispute and identifying a point of entry from which an online dispute resolution process was initiated while Group IX is directed a method of administering an online resolution dispute process by automatically prioritizing for handling by a dispute resolution specialist, presenting an interface to highlight key attributes, displaying visual alerts if cases are not handled according to defined parameters, and displaying the disputes to the specialist based on the prioritization. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not

encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

25. Inventions III and X are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group III is directed to a method and system of determining one or more proposed solutions to a dispute and identifying a point of entry from which an online dispute resolution process was initiated while Group X is directed a method of accepting a commitment made by an online entity to a selling practice, delivering a media object to a device for presentment to a potential buyer wherein the media object is unique to the online entity and representative of a seal of certification of the online entity, and applying the online dispute resolution process to any dispute that arises between the online entity and the potential buyer. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

26. Inventions IV and V are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the

inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group IV is directed to a method and system of processing a dispute in accordance with an automatic verification process while Group V is directed a method and system of presenting a proposed resolution regarding an online dispute by routing case information through dispute resolution modules and applying online dispute resolution process.

Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

27. Inventions IV and VI are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group IV is directed to a method and system of processing a dispute in accordance with an automatic verification process while Group VI is directed a method and system of determining a proposed resolution of a dispute by through the use of a reputation rating system of an online marketplace and updating the reputation rating system of at least on a party as a function of the resolution. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

28. Inventions IV and VII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can

have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group IV is directed to a method and system of processing a dispute in accordance with an automatic verification process while Group VII is directed a method of automatically updating a reputation rating of a user of an online marketplace by monitoring the online marketplace to detect feedback by a second user and notifying the first user of negative feedback to resolve a dispute on which the feedback is based. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

29. Inventions IV and VIII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group IV is directed to a method and system of processing a dispute in accordance with an automatic verification process while Group VIII is directed methods of resolving a dispute by receiving commitment for a payment for the electronic dispute resolution process from the parties, receiving payment from the parties, and presenting the proposed resolution.

Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

30. Inventions IV and IX are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group IV is directed to a method and system of processing a dispute in accordance with an automatic verification process while Group IX is directed a method of administering an online resolution dispute process by automatically prioritizing for handling by a dispute resolution specialist, presenting an interface to highlight key attributes, displaying visual alerts if cases are not handled according to defined parameters, and displaying the disputes to the specialist based on the prioritization. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

31. Inventions IV and X are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group IV is directed

to a method and system of processing a dispute in accordance with an automatic verification process while Group X is directed to a method of accepting a commitment made by an online entity to a selling practice, delivering a media object to a device for presentment to a potential buyer wherein the media object is unique to the online entity and representative of a seal of certification of the online entity, and applying the online dispute resolution process to any dispute that arises between the online entity and the potential buyer. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

32. Inventions V and VI are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group V is directed to a method and system of presenting a proposed resolution regarding an online dispute by routing case information through dispute resolution modules and applying online dispute resolution process while Group VI is directed to a method and system of determining a proposed resolution of a dispute by through the use of a reputation rating system of an online marketplace and updating the reputation rating system of at least on a party as a function of the resolution. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

33. Inventions V and VII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group V is directed to a method and system of presenting a proposed resolution regarding an online dispute by routing case information through dispute resolution modules and applying online dispute resolution process while Group VII is directed to a method of automatically updating a reputation rating of a user of an online marketplace by monitoring the online marketplace to detect feedback by a second user and notifying the first user of negative feedback to resolve a dispute on which the feedback is based. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

34. Inventions V and VIII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group V is directed to a method and system of presenting a proposed resolution regarding an online dispute by routing case information through dispute resolution modules and applying online

dispute resolution process while Group VIII is directed to methods of resolving a dispute by receiving commitment for a payment for the electronic dispute resolution process from the parties, receiving payment from the parties, and presenting the proposed resolution. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

35. Inventions V and IX are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group V is directed to a method and system of presenting a proposed resolution regarding an online dispute by routing case information through dispute resolution modules and applying online dispute resolution process while Group IX is directed to a method of administering an online resolution dispute process by automatically prioritizing for handling by a dispute resolution specialist, presenting an interface to highlight key attributes, displaying visual alerts if cases are not handled according to defined parameters, and displaying the disputes to the specialist based on the prioritization. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

36. Inventions V and X are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can

have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group V is directed to a method and system of presenting a proposed resolution regarding an online dispute by routing case information through dispute resolution modules and applying online dispute resolution process while Group X is directed to a method of accepting a commitment made by an online entity to a selling practice, delivering a media object to a device for presentment to a potential buyer wherein the media object is unique to the online entity and representative of a seal of certification of the online entity, and applying the online dispute resolution process to any dispute that arises between the online entity and the potential buyer. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

37. Inventions VI and VII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group VI is directed to a method and system of determining a proposed resolution of a dispute by through the use of a reputation rating system of an online marketplace and updating the

reputation rating system of at least on a party as a function of the resolution while Group VII is directed to a method of automatically updating a reputation rating of a user of an online marketplace by monitoring the online marketplace to detect feedback by a second user and notifying the first user of negative feedback to resolve a dispute on which the feedback is based. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

38. Inventions VI and VIII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group VI is directed to a method and system of determining a proposed resolution of a dispute by through the use of a reputation rating system of an online marketplace and updating the reputation rating system of at least on a party as a function of the resolution while Group VIII is directed to methods of resolving a dispute by receiving commitment for a payment for the electronic dispute resolution process from the parties, receiving payment from the parties, and presenting the proposed resolution. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

39. Inventions VI and IX are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group VI is directed to a method and system of determining a proposed resolution of a dispute by through the use of a reputation rating system of an online marketplace and updating the reputation rating system of at least on a party as a function of the resolution while Group IX is directed to a method of administering an online resolution dispute process by automatically prioritizing for handling by a dispute resolution specialist, presenting an interface to highlight key attributes, displaying visual alerts if cases are not handled according to defined parameters, and displaying the disputes to the specialist based on the prioritization. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

40. Inventions VI and X are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group VI is directed

to a method and system of determining a proposed resolution of a dispute by through the use of a reputation rating system of an online marketplace and updating the reputation rating system of at least on a party as a function of the resolution while Group X is directed to a method of accepting a commitment made by an online entity to a selling practice, delivering a media object to a device for presentment to a potential buyer wherein the media object is unique to the online entity and representative of a seal of certification of the online entity, and applying the online dispute resolution process to any dispute that arises between the online entity and the potential buyer. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

41. Inventions VII and VIII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group VII is directed to a method of automatically updating a reputation rating of a user of an online marketplace by monitoring the online marketplace to detect feedback by a second user and notifying the first user of negative feedback to resolve a dispute on which the feedback is based while Group VIII is directed to methods of resolving a dispute by receiving commitment for a payment for the electronic dispute resolution process from the parties, receiving payment from the parties, and presenting the proposed resolution.

Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

42. Inventions VII and IX are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group VII is directed to a method of automatically updating a reputation rating of a user of an online marketplace by monitoring the online marketplace to detect feedback by a second user and notifying the first user of negative feedback to resolve a dispute on which the feedback is based while Group IX is directed to a method of administering an online resolution dispute process by automatically prioritizing for handling by a dispute resolution specialist, presenting an interface to highlight key attributes, displaying visual alerts if cases are not handled according to defined parameters, and displaying the disputes to the specialist based on the prioritization. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

43. Inventions VII and X are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as

claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group VII is directed to a method of automatically updating a reputation rating of a user of an online marketplace by monitoring the online marketplace to detect feedback by a second user and notifying the first user of negative feedback to resolve a dispute on which the feedback is based while Group X is directed to a method of accepting a commitment made by an online entity to a selling practice, delivering a media object to a device for presentment to a potential buyer wherein the media object is unique to the online entity and representative of a seal of certification of the online entity, and applying the online dispute resolution process to any dispute that arises between the online entity and the potential buyer. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

44. Inventions VIII and IX are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group VIII is directed to methods of resolving a dispute by receiving commitment for a payment for the electronic dispute resolution process from the parties, receiving payment from the parties, and presenting the proposed resolution while Group IX is directed to a method of administering an online resolution dispute process by automatically prioritizing for

handling by a dispute resolution specialist, presenting an interface to highlight key attributes, displaying visual alerts if cases are not handled according to defined parameters, and displaying the disputes to the specialist based on the prioritization. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

45. Inventions VIII and X are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group VIII is directed to methods of resolving a dispute by receiving commitment for a payment for the electronic dispute resolution process from the parties, receiving payment from the parties, and presenting the proposed resolution while Group X is directed to a method of accepting a commitment made by an online entity to a selling practice, delivering a media object to a device for presentment to a potential buyer wherein the media object is unique to the online entity and representative of a seal of certification of the online entity, and applying the online dispute resolution process to any dispute that arises between the online entity and the potential buyer. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

46. Inventions IX and X are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed would require a different field of search since Group IX is directed to a method of administering an online resolution dispute process by automatically prioritizing for handling by a dispute resolution specialist, presenting an interface to highlight key attributes, displaying visual alerts if cases are not handled according to defined parameters, and displaying the disputes to the specialist based on the prioritization while Group X is directed to a method of accepting a commitment made by an online entity to a selling practice, delivering a media object to a device for presentment to a potential buyer wherein the media object is unique to the online entity and representative of a seal of certification of the online entity, and applying the online dispute resolution process to any dispute that arises between the online entity and the potential buyer. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

47. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after

the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

48. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerardo Araque Jr. whose telephone number is (571)272-3747. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janice Mooneyham can be reached on (571) 272-6805. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 3689
9/24/08

/Janice A. Mooneyham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3689